

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME L. GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING SECURITY SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

Nos. C 12-5093 JSW (PR)  
C 12-5366 JSW (PR)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

Over the course of approximately three weeks, Plaintiff, an inmate in the San Francisco County Jail and frequent litigator in this court, filed these nine pro se civil rights cases. On May 18, 2000, this Court informed Plaintiff that under the "three-strikes" provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) he generally is ineligible to proceed *in forma pauperis* in federal court with civil actions filed while he is incarcerated. *See Grimes v. Oakland Police Dept.*, C 00-1100 CW (Order Dismissing Complaint, 5/18/00). Since then, Plaintiff has continued to file hundreds of civil actions seeking *in forma pauperis* status. With respect to each action filed, the Court conducts a preliminary review to assess the nature of the allegations and to determine whether Plaintiff alleges facts which bring him within the "imminent danger of serious physical injury" exception to § 1915(g). In the past, Plaintiff has routinely been granted leave to amend to pay the full filing fee and to state cognizable claims for relief, but he has habitually failed to do so. For example, in 2003 alone Plaintiff's failure to comply resulted in the dismissal of approximately thirty-six actions under § 1915(g).

1 In accord with this ongoing practice, the Court has reviewed the allegations in the  
2 present actions and finds that Plaintiff alleges no facts which bring him within the  
3 "imminent danger" clause. Succinctly put, these actions make a wide variety o  
4 nonsensical and frivolous allegations about a wide range of unrelated events, including  
5 among many others, the Jonestown massacre, Viagra overdoses, the September 11  
6 terrorist attacks, and the Oklahoma City bombings. On numerous occasions, Plaintiff has  
7 been informed that he may not proceed with frivolous allegations and he has failed to  
8 cure these problems when given leave to amend. Therefore granting leave to amend  
9 would be futile. And even if Plaintiff did amend, he would be required to pay the  
10 \$350.00 filing fee, which he has never done.

11 Accordingly, this action is DISMISSED without prejudice under § 1915(g). The  
12 applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* are DENIED. No fee is due. If Plaintiff is so  
13 inclined, he may bring his claims in a new action accompanied by the \$350.00 filing fee.  
14 In any event, the Court will continue to review under § 1915(g) all future actions filed by  
15 Plaintiff while he is incarcerated in which he seeks *in forma pauperis* status.

16 The Clerk of the Court shall CLOSE the file and TERMINATE all pending  
17 motions.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: November 5, 2012

20   
21 JEFFREY S. WHITE  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPUTY MILLER et al,

Defendant.

Case Number: CV12-05093 JSW

Case Number: CV12-05366 JSW


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on November 5, 2012, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Jerome L. Grimes  
S.F.J.C.  
1 Moreland Drive  
#12675072  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Dated: November 5, 2012

  
Richard W. Wieking, Clerk  
By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk